

Eric,  
Attached is an edited version of your letter. When both approaches are applied to the entire chemistry data set (Category 1 data), agreement between the approaches in classifying samples as low or moderate-high probability of toxicity is >80%. I've also attached 2 pdfs (one for NOAA pmax model and one for LWG FPM) of the approaches applied to the entire chemistry data set (n=1530). Comparing the two figures, it appears that both approaches are identifying the same geographic areas with low and high probability of toxicity. I'm not sure we should expect much more from the models.

Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov wrote:

- > Jay, attached is a draft cover letter. I have included three bullets
- > about how to move forward in the Round 2 Report. They do not match up
- > exactly with what you have provided below but hopefully capture what we
- > want. Look this over, add any general statements you would like to make
- > and send me your comments.

> (See attached file: EPAPredictiveModelCommentsCover070606.doc)

```
> Rob/Chip/Eric,  
> Rob's quick summary intro section is not entirely consistent with our  
> discussion in Centralia. I've included a revised version below. Please  
> call me if you have any questions.  
> thanks,  
> Jay
```

```
> 1) The proposed threshold numbers for Total PAH as derived from the
> Floating Percentile Model (FPM) are patently unacceptable and should be
> discarded. Values for PAHs should be based on NOAA's Logistic
> Regression Model (LRM) or freshwater consensus PECs (MacDonald, D. D.,
> C. G. Ingersoll, et al. 2000).
```

> 3) The results for the *Hyalella* growth and survival endpoint should be  
> included in the identification potential areas of concern.

> Jay's email was restored. I've made some slight editorial changes  
> to his comments and added an introductory section which neither he  
> nor Ron have seen, but it attempts to lay out the three key issues  
> (as we discussed). I'm submitting these comments to you and Chip  
> for the moment as draft in the event Ron and/or Jay and/or you and  
> Chip have any additional thoughts or questions. I'll hold on a  
> broader circulation until sometime next week.

```
>
>      Have an extraordinary weekend.
>
>      -R
>
>  --
>
>  _____
> Jay Field
> Coastal Protection and Restoration Division
> Office of Response and Restoration, NOAA
> 7600 Sand Point Way NE
> Seattle, WA 98115-6349
> (P) 206-526-6404
> (F) 206-526-6865
> (E) jay.field@noaa.gov
> http://response.restoration.noaa.gov/cpr/cpr.html
>
--
Jay Field
Coastal Protection and Restoration Division
Office of Response and Restoration, NOAA
7600 Sand Point Way NE
Seattle, WA 98115-6349
(P) 206-526-6404
(F) 206-526-6865
(E) jay.field@noaa.gov
http://response.restoration.noaa.gov/cpr/cpr.html
```